1:Heckewelder M-5 (ca. 1800)1819
NM7 Delaware NM7
Huron NG5

H
156
727

duct of this chief, and by his manly and resolute appearance, that they had not time to reflect upon what they should do, and before their astonishment was well over, the prisoner was out of their reach.

CHAPTER XIX.

WARS AND THE CAUSES WHICH LEAD TO THEM.

D
577
571
721
648

IT is a fixed principle with the Indians, that evil cannot come out of good, that no friend will injure a friend, and, therefore, that whoever wrongs or does harm to another, is his ENEMY. As it is with individuals, so it is with nations, tribes and other independent associations of men. If they commit murder on another people, encroach on their lands, by making it a practice to come within their bounds and take the game from them, if they rob or steal from their hunting camps, or, in short, are guilty of any act of unjust aggression, they cannot be considered otherwise than as ENEMIES; they are declared to be such, and the aggrieved nation think themselves justifiable in punishing them. If murder has been perpetrated, revenge is taken in the same way. If a lesser injury has been done, a message is sent to the chief of the nation to which the wrong-doers belong, to enquire whether the act complained of was authorised, if not to give them warning not to permit the like thing to be done again. If theft or some other like offence has been committed, restitution is at the same time demanded, or such reparation as the case admits of, and the chiefs are de-

2:Newcomb E-4, 5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

627 If peace could not be restored through the payment of "blood money," the interested kin, in case of murder, resolved the case by the murder of the guilty party or one of his kin.[183] From the scanty evidence available it would appear that only in the case of unresolved murders which were upsetting internal peace would society step in to halt the conflict.

576 431 Little is known about etiquette and the customary ways in which people behaved towards one another. Penn, however, said:

> In liberality they excel. Nothing is too good for their friend. Give them a fine gun, coat, or other thing, it may pass twenty hands before it sticks: light of heart, strong affections, but soon spent: the most merry creatures that live: they feast and dance perpetually; they never have much, nor want much. Wealth circulateth like the blood. All parts partake; and though none shall want what another hath, yet exact observers of property.[184]

Denton in the same vein said:

> They are extraordinary charitable one to another, one having nothing to spare, but he freely imparts it to his friends & whatsoever they get by gaming or any other way, they share one to another leaving themselves commonly the least share.[185]

● 571 This sort of behavior is, of course, to be expected in a society organized upon a kinship basis. Society was predicated, not on the competition between individuals, but upon mutual assistance and the unity of action of the kin group. Respect for, and solicitous care of, the aged has also been noted.[186]

War

726 174 Small-scale, probably infrequent raiding by a few warriors was the typical form of warfare in early historic times and undoubtedly in the pre-European period. This type of conflict was a personal, usually non-economic feuding. An apt designation for it might be primitive war, since it seems to be characteristic of many cultures at this and lower technological levels of development. A special term for it is necessary since it generally differs in its causation, purpose, and form from total, modern warfare. There is little evidence that chronic, full-scale, economically caused warfare existed aboriginally in what is now northeastern United States. Hunt shared this point of view in writing of the Iroquois, generally considered to have been the most warlike of peoples in this area! He said:

> In the beginning intertribal rivalries were not keen, and intertribal war was purely private and social interprise. But before long the European trade was to create new rivalries, and whet old ones to the point where the issue became one of survival.[187]

---

[183] Van der Donck, 1909, p. 303.
[184] Penn, 1882, p. 243.
[185] Denton, 1845, p. 9. Also see Zeisberger, 1910, pp. 115-18.
[186] Zeisberger, 1910, p. 123; Heckewelder, 1881, p. 103.
[187] Hunt, 1939, p. 22.

2:Newcomb E-4, 5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

No pottery was manufactured in
1777 Oklahoma by the Delawares, although some of the aged Delawares re-
28 member that their grandmothers made undecorated utility pottery.
32 Dress and adornment had approximated that of the neighboring whites by the turn of the century. Men of the Cherokee-Delaware band, however, continued to wear their hair long until about 1920. Today, the only distinctive dress of the Delawares is worn at social and religious gatherings, and on these occasions it is of a miscellaneous Indian type rather than being specifically Delaware.

In sum, Delaware technology and material culture since 1867 have increasingly approximated the American pattern, particularly that of the poorer, rural, white groups. There are virtually no outward signs in subsistence, housing, or dress, which distinguish the Delawares from other Oklahomans.

Sociological Assimilation

X177 It has already been noted that the social organization of the Dela-
● 571 wares had undergone considerable alteration before the final flight to
619 Indian Territory. Perhaps the most important change to take place after 1867 was the complete surrender of political authority. It should be recalled that the contract between the Cherokees and the Delawares provided for the admittance of the Delawares into the Cherokee tribe. Delaware chieftainship continued for a time, the last principal chief being Charles Journeycake, who served in this capacity from 1861 until he died in 1895.[3] After 1900 tribal chiefs were elected. Each of the three phratries nominated one candidate, the one who received the most votes became the chief. The principal duty of the chief was to act as a representative of the tribe in business dealings with the government. The last chief, Charles Elkhair, died in 1935 and has not been officially replaced. A business committee is the only formal governmental organization that continues in existence. It serves in an advisory capacity when there are claims against the government.[4]

The Delawares no longer have a society which is based upon ties of kinship. Outside of the immediate family there are no economic activities which depend upon the mutual aid of the clan, phratry, or other kinship groups. They have been completely assimilated into the American economic system. There is no feeling that care or assistance should be extended to other Delawares; in fact, in both Delaware communities there is a good deal of friction, jealousy, and antagonism between different individuals and family groups. This friction extends to all levels of organization, even to the business committee, with which there is always dissatisfaction. "They can't agree on a chief, they pull in different ways: if one person suggests something, somebody knocks him down" (O.A.). Probably this constant friction is a result of the heterogeneous degree of acculturation; some individuals are old, nearly illiterate, very

[3] Mitchell, 1895, pp. 7, 45. (This is a biography of the chief.)
[4] Wright, 1951, p. 153; J.T., O.A.

2:Newcomb E-4, 5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

conservative, distrustful of whites, and, in general, less acculturated than others who are young, literate, moderately educated, progressive, and well assimilated. There is an antipeyote faction, and even within the peyote faction there is a schism between the Big Moon and Little Moon adherents. These various factions promote discord, so much so that any unified tribal activity is virtually impossible. The Delawares are, then, no longer a distinct social group. Delaware society has disappeared, although allegiance to a number of the ancient culture traits lingers.

The most notable remnant of socioreligious organization still perpetuated by both Oklahoma Delaware communities is the phratry. Adults still acknowledge membership in one or more of the phratries. Membership was originally determined by descent in the female line, but this is no longer true; a person inherits membership in both his mother's and father's phratry, so that many individuals consider themselves to be "half and half." An individual can belong to no more than two of the three phratries. Consequently, it is apparent that if this method of reckoning membership is carried on for many generations most people will belong to two of the three phratries. There is no memory of any other system of reckoning membership. Obviously, the shift in the method of determining phratry membership has been caused by the emphasis on the paternal line in American society. At least among the Cherokee-Delawares the pressure has not been strong enough to shift the system from simple matrilineal reckoning all the way to patrilineal, as in our patronymics; it has gone but an illogical part way. Phratry membership originally depended upon clan ties, but there is no knowledge of them today in either Delaware community. The conclusion is inescapable that the clan organization disappeared before the Delawares left Kansas.

An interesting factor contributing to the eventual extinction of Delaware culture and also to social heterogeneity is found in present marriage restrictions. It is considered incestuous for a person to marry anyone to whom he is related, however remotely. This means that in both Oklahoma communities the young Delaware boys and girls cannot marry other Delawares, since everybody is considered to be related to everyone else. Some of the feelings about this point were: "The young people are disgusted, can't find anybody they're not kin to" (O.A.). "We're disappearing as fast as we can 'cause we got nobody to marry" (O.A.). "It's awful when you marry kinfolks" (M.B.). Briefly, one generation hence there will be no person who is more than half Delaware biologically, and probably none more than half sociologically. (This subject is taken up more fully under Pan-Indianism.) Within the last several decades the Delawares have taken to marrying legally and are completely assimilated in this respect.

Religious Assimilation

Big House Ceremony.—Without a doubt the most tenacious and unchanging elements in Delaware culture, aside from language, have been

[P. 35, A]

584 marriage would furthermore be congenial to the parents of both parties.[15] In practice
586 these marriages usually broke up quickly, both spouses quickly being unfaithful to one another.[16] Occasionally a man, his
[762] pride wounded by a wife's infidelity, directed his helpless anger inward and committed suicide by taking poison. Women too killed themselves out of jealousy.[17] The shifting romantic attachments of both sexes seem to represent an unending striving to find the all-satisfying parent: a striving continually doomed to frustration.

787 The guardian spirit relationship (which was sought by both men and women) seems also to be built upon the prototype of the search for the all-satisfying (but not authoritarian) parent.[18]

572 Among men there was an institution of "friendship" which focused considerable emotion upon a relationship of formally recognized mutual dependency, in war, in
[521] the chase, and in various other life-crises.[19] Men were more at ease with one another
[562] in conversation than with women and, according to Zeisberger, would automatically suspect as a lie any tale which they
[593] heard from a woman.[20] It was a common saying: "My wife is not my friend."[21] Old
888 women were accused by the men of being
439 the middlemen who carried the socially disrupting rum from white settlements to the villages.[22]

562 Implicit in all this was the assumption on the part of all Delawares—men and
● 571 women alike—that relationships with women, while they could be satisfying, were not likely to be; and the further assumption on the part of men that they had less to fear from other men than from

15. Heckewelder, 1819, p. 161; Zeisberger, 1778, p. 79.
16. Zeisberger, 1778, pp. 82-83.
17. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 83.
18. Lindestrom, 1656, pp. 207-209; Heckewelder, 1819, pp. 245-246; Zeisberger, 1778, p. 127.
19. Heckewelder, 1819, p. 278; Lindestrom, 1656, p. 233; Zeisberger, 1778, p. 116.
20. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 116.
21. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 99.
22. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 117.

[P. 35, B]

562
571 women, and might safely therefore be more "friendly" with them.

Oral Fixation

153 There is some evidence to suggest a preoccupation, which had a large component of aggressiveness, with oral needs. This concern with eating (and with other oral phenomena, such as ritualistic pipe-smoking, naming, and oratory), which reached far beyond subsistence requirements, can hardly be ascribed to a realistic subsistence anxiety since the Delawares had ample supplies of animal and vegetable foods at their disposal, and adequate techniques for cultivating, gathering, preserving, and storing them. It is worth
[787] mentioning that the pubescent Delaware solicited the favor of a guardian spirit by self-imposed fasting; the spirit was supposed to pity him and appear in a vision; later the spirit would be important to him in helping to secure food.[23] Oral rituals, often with a compulsive quality, were a
[527] recurrent institutional theme: almost all social gatherings involved eating, smoking, and oratory, and some were frankly eating-orgies—the famous "eat-all" feasts, for example; the fondness for liquor may be regarded as an oral trait of compulsive
[757] character;[24] internal medicines were usually
[758] taken as liquid herbal infusions, usually in large doses;[25] the sick lived on a liquid
[754] diet;[26] suicide and witchcraft were both
762] accomplished in most cases by poison taken by mouth;[27] tortured prisoners were some-
[727] times ceremonially eaten, and hunger
266] cannibalism was reported;[28] war parties made a ceremonial feast the night before their departure;[29] emetics were extensively
[757] used in the treatment of disease, and vomit-
777] ing was thought to relieve a sense of guilt, and also to bring luck.[30]

---

23. Zeisberger, 1778, pp. 132-133.
24. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 116; Heckewelder, 1819, p. 263.
25. Zeisberger, 1778, pp. 24-25; Tantaquidgeon.
26. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 24.
27. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 125; Heckewelder, 1819, p. 258.
28. Heckewelder, 1819, p. 199; Zeisberger, 1778, p. 107-108.
29. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 103.
30. Zeisberger, 1778, pp. 84, 133-134.

[P.39, A]

355 receiving from their mothers adequate physical care, especially in early infancy, but that the child did not receive much of what we would call "affection" or "love" and from time to time was neglected and subjected to petty meanness. The father had only intermittent contact with the mother-child nexus, and to the child appeared as a distant potentially loving (and perhaps also potentially threatening), but practically [861] remote figure. Neither parent made use of systematic punishment as an educative technique. The male child grew up into an adult who saw women both as 86 romantic ideals and as untrustworthy 562 and malicious, potentially witches, while men were regarded as potential comrades, toward whom nevertheless highly polite, circumspect behavior was required in order to avoid giving offense. Women grew up to be discreet but covertly malicious wives and mothers. No individual of either sex was conceived as [571] the possessor of unquestioned authority, and social relations hence were very individualistic and fissionable. There is 155 evidence to suggest that the individual remained somewhat fixed, on an unconscious level, to infantile patterns of "oral" reaction, of a dependent, aggressively demanding nature, although these dependency patterns were masked by a superficial individualism and self-sufficiency, and by careful inhibition of any openly aggressive behavior. The conflict between the dependent and aggressive impulses, on the one hand, and the conscientious efforts to be self-sufficient and unaggressive on the other, was partially resolved by the guardian spirit complex, a technique of personality integration which allowed the adolescent to collect his dependency wishes and displace them onto the fantasy figure of an all-powerful parent. Further relief was afforded by various institutionalized ritual or semi-ritual institutions, such as warfare, feasting, and religion. Liquor, however, was a severe threat to the integrity of the society, since it allowed repressed and sublimated im-